REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the amendments above and remarks below is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 are currently before the Examiner. Claims 1-3 have been amended to make minor corrections to the form. New claim 4 has been added to include the "preferred embodiment" language deleted from claim 2.

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bossaerts *et al.* (WO 97/20129) in view of Wu (4,541,489). Claim 2 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Bossaerts *et al.* (WO 97/20129) in view of Wu (4,541,489) and further in view of Dewprashad *et al.* (5,368,102). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Specifically the office action admits that Bossaerts *et al.* does not teach a method wherein the viscosified aliphatic hydrocarbon fluid is a solvent and contains a curing agent that occurs in a concentration in the range of 0.5 to 20 %m and wherein the solution has a viscosity such that the ratio between the viscosity of the solution in step (d) and of the solution in step (e) is in the range of from 1.0 to 5.0. The office action also admits that Bossaerts *et al.* fails to teach a method wherein the curing agent is selected from aliphatic polyamines, alkyl-aryl polyamines, and more preferably diethylene toluene diamine. The office action then cites Wu as teaching such a method wherein the viscosified aliphatic hydrocarbon fluid is a solvent and contains a curing agent in the range of 0.5 to 20%m and where the ratio between the viscosity of the solution in step (d) and of the solution in step (e) is in the range of from 1.0 to 5.0. Wu is further cited as teaching a method where the curing agent is selected from aliphatic polyamines, alkyl-aryl polyamines and more preferably diethylene toluene diamine (DETDA). The office action concludes it would be obvious to modify Bossaerts *et al.* in view of Wu because it would allow the formation to have no water or hydrocarbons left therein, and additionally, the formation would be fully saturated with the solvent for the consolidation fluids.

In response, applicants state that, in additions to the difference cited by the Examiner, claim 1 of the present invention also differs from Bossaerts *et al.* in that the curing agent is added to the formation after the polyepoxy resin, in solution, in a hydrocarbon solvent. Bossaerts *et al.* does not teach the method of the present invention, or suggest that the specifically claimed viscosity ratio and sequential addition of resin, then curing agent, would provide better control of the location of where curing takes place in high temperature environments, and an improvement in obtaining thin layers of epoxy resin.

Applicants further state that Wu is directed to removal of flow restricting materials from wells, which have already been treated with epoxy resin, by contacting such flow restricting materials with N-methyl-2-pyrrolidone. Wu merely lists well known epoxy resins and curing agents. Further, Wu states it is of course preferable to introduce the curing agent first since when amines are utilized, the curing agent also acts as a wetting agent. (See col. 6, lines 3-6.).

Therefore, Wu does not solve the deficiencies of Bossaerts *et al.* The combination does not teach or suggest the method of claim 1 of the present invention or the resulting higher permeability when compared to prior art methods. The combination would at most suggest that, after utilizing the formation treating method of Bossaerts *et al.*, to further contact the formation with a solvent comprising N-methyl-2-pyrrolidone to form a flowable fluid to remove flow restricting material.

Referring to the above discussion, further combination of Dewprashad *et al.* with Bossaerts *et al.* and Wu in regard to claim 2 does not solve the deficiency of that combination with regard to claim 1. Claim 2 is dependent upon and incorporates the limitations of claim 1 as is considered patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

In light of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims of the present application are in condition for allowance.

If it would be of assistance with this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Kimes Jones
Registration No. 41,878

Date: 2-21-2006

Hexion Specialty Chemicals, Inc.
1600 Smith Street 24th Floor, P.O. Box 4500
Houston, Texas 77210-4500

Direct Phone: (832) 366-2571
Direct Facsimile: (817) 375-2768
lisa.jones@hexionchem.com